UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,188	04/07/2004	Thomas Beckmann	510.1100	7423
	7590 06/30/200 dson & Kappel, LLC	EXAMINER		
485 7th Avenue 14th Floor		AKRAM, IMRAN		
New York, NY	10018	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/820,188	BECKMANN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
IMRAN AKRAM			

	IMRAN AKRAM	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi real (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth atter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended and 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount o	36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate	e extension fee ate extension fee
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing dat	e of the final rejection, e	ven if timely filed,
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to thin the time period set forth in 37 (avoid dismissal of the CFR 41.37(a).	appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	· ·		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c			
NOTE: <u>The refutation of the rejection of claim 1 over 100 to 100</u>			
considered as different grounds for rejection/further			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	OL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Alexa D. Neckel/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795			
Tapa Sory i storic Examinor, fitt office froo			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 6/6/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include dependent claim 5. However, claim 5 was properly rejected and so claim 1 remains rejected over Barbir, as well.

Applicant asserts on page 6 of the arguments that the previously filed Office Action does not attempt to indicate where Barbir disclose the limitation found in claim 5: a diaphragm pump selectively permeable for hydrogen. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As can be found in paragraphs 3 and 15 of the Final Rejection dated 2/4/08, the Barbir reference discloses this feature in paragraph 31 of the publication. The functioning of a diaphragm pump is well known in the art and Barbir explicitly disclosing that the pump is for selectively pumping hydrogen.

In response to applicant's argument that Michelfelder is nonanalogous art to the Barbir reference, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Michelfelder discloses an invention for recirculation for the reduction of contaminants-a goal of Barbir. Regarding claim 2, Michelfelder discloses reducing contaminants emitted from the combustion of fuels as Applicant states in page 7 of the Arguments. This is very much a pertinent problem to overcome in the closely analogous process of fuel reformation disclosed in Barbir and common in the art.

In regard to the rejection of claim 4 over Barbir in view of Faye, Applicant asserts that the Faye reference teaches away from the claimed invention in that it vents residual gas instead of recirculating it between the reformer and enrichment device. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The recirculated hydrogen of figure 4 can be deemed the residual gas and is brought back between the reformer and enrichment device 16 as shown.